

## STADIUM IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

Monday November 19, 2012

4–6 p.m.

319 City Hall

### *Meeting Minutes*

**Committee members present;** Chairs: Tom Fisher, David Wilson. Members: Hussein Ahmed, Tim Baylor, Judy Yates Borger, Sandra Colvin Roy, Chris Ferguson, David Fields, Clint Hewitt, Diane Hofstede, Betsy Hodges, Barbara Johnson, Peggy Lucas, Peter McLaughlin, Cory Merrifield, Tom Meyer, James Norkosky, Kevin Reich, Craig Taylor,

**Committee members excused:** Russ Adams, Rolf Engh, Sarah Harris, Wade Luneburg, R.T. Rybak, Cathy Rydell, Jesse Winkler

**Guests:** Kristin Anderson (Augsburg College); Lynn Regnier (Elliot Park); Phil Eckert (Hennepin County); Nick Koch (HGA); Jim Harwood (Metro Transit); Bob Fine (Minneapolis Park Board); Bill McCarthy, Barbara Butts Williams (MSFA); Lester Bagley (Mn Vikings); Nacho Diaz; Robert Woods

**Staff/consultants present:** Peter Brown, Hilary Dvorak, Jeff Handeland, Velma Korbel, Chuck Lutz, Erik Nilsson, Jennifer O'Rourke, Sally Westby

**1.0 Call to order** – the meeting was called to order at **4:10 p.m. by co-chair Tom Fisher.**

**2.0 Approval of Minutes of 10/15/12 meeting** - It was **MOVED by Hewitt and SECONDED by Taylor that the minutes of the 10/15/12 Committee meeting be approved. The motion CARRIED.**

**3.0 Updates** – Chuck Lutz noted that a major portion of the meeting would be devoted to hearing from City staff about the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process for the new Stadium. The EIS is the critical path for the stadium project moving forward. The draft EIS will likely be back in front of the Implementation Committee for comments in March 2013.

In regard to stadium design, Lutz reported that a very productive session was held last month between City staff and HKS, the stadium architects. The Schematic Design for the Stadium is scheduled for presentation in March 2013.

**4.0 Design Progress and Schedule** – Bill McCarthy of the Minnesota Sports Facilities Authority (MSFA) reported on progress to date. HKS is hard at work and will have a 50% schematic design completed in late January 2013 and 100% in March 2013.

Requests for Proposals (RFPs) are currently out for a number of sub-consultants including: associate architect; climate and wind, disability (ADA); concessionaire; landscaping; audio-visual; way finding; and signage and lighting. The RFP for construction manager will be issued in December 2012.

On Friday November 16, the MSFA approved the Women Minority Business Enterprise (WMBE) plan for the subcontracts under HKS' design contract. The plan sets a goal of utilizing 11% women owned businesses and 8% minority owned under the design contract.

HKS met with Implementation Committee members Tom Fisher and Tom Meyer on Monday November 12 to discuss the new stadium design.

In response to questions, Velma Korbel of the Minneapolis Civil Rights Department said that the goal for the utilization of women owned businesses is higher than the goal for minority owned businesses because there are more women owned firms that can do the type of design and engineering work required under the subcontracts. A minority-woman owned business would be classified as a minority owned firm. Korbel said that there would be a separate WMBE plan approved for construction work once the Construction Manager is hired. McCarthy said that the MSFA would oversee the achievement of WMBE goals.

## **5.0 Overview of Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Process – Assistant City Attorney Erik Nilsson and Jeff Handeland of Public Works reviewed the process for the stadium EIS.**

Nilsson provided a high level overview of the environmental review law (appendix A). The purpose of the state-mandated Environment Review Program is to assess and mitigate significant environmental effects caused by public and private actions. The process exists for information gathering. It is not a test that an entity has to pass or fail. The information gathered is expected to inform government entities' traditional land use processes. One of the things that will be reviewed today is how a traditional process would work as compared to how the process for the stadium will work since the latter is guided by language in State statute rather than City land use approvals.

Traditionally, the enforcement mechanism for an EIS is a moratorium on any permits or construction work until the EIS is completed. However, the stadium legislation has an exemption from the moratorium provision. While the EIS must be determined to be adequate before work can start on the stadium foundation, other work can be started including land acquisition, financing, site preparation permits and other land use approvals etc. (Appendix A page 4-5). Nilsson said that an important issue is the timing of the final design plans and the timing for the EIS. Ideally the two processes would not occur in isolation and they would inform each other.

In response to a question from Hodges, Nilsson said that the only moratorium in effect before completion of the EIS would be a moratorium on constructing the foundation of the building. Assuming that the draft EIS is completed in March 2013, EIS adequacy would be determined a month or two after that date. At that time, construction of the foundation could begin. Work that could occur before the EIS is completed would include demolition and below grade infrastructure work.

Tim Baylor asked if there were any special issues of which the committee should be aware given that the new building would be a football stadium on the site of a football stadium. Jeff Handeland said that there would be some differences between the two facilities that could be relevant to the EIS. The new building will be larger, have more seats and different parking requirements. Sandra Colvin Roy noted that there was also no City storm water management ordinance in place when the Dome was built. Even though a stadium already exists on the site, Nilsson said that a mandatory EIS is required by statute because the peak attendance for the facility will be more than 20, 000 persons.

In response to a question from David Wilson, Nilsson said that the stadium legislation mentions exemptions from City land use and development reviews. The legislation does not appear to waive compliance with storm water regulations. City staff has made the architects aware of the City's storm water ordinance and is expecting compliance. Colvin Roy noted that the Implementation Committee also adopted a principle calling for storm water ordinance compliance.

The MSFA is the Responsible Governmental Unit (RGU) for the Stadium even though the building is in the City of Minneapolis. As a result, the Authority is the body that conducts the environmental review and makes the adequacy determination. The MSFA is doing the EIS and has retained consultants to help prepare it.

In response to a question from Betsy Hodges, Nilsson said it is not typical for the RGU to be same body that is responsible for conducting the EIS. Typically the RGU is the body having the largest approval authority but in this case the legislation established the Authority as the RGU.

Jeff Handeland outlined topics that will be reviewed in depth in the EIS and upon which mitigation measures could be developed (Appendix A page 3). An important topic is traffic, which will likely include all modes of transportation as well as parking and how people get to and from parking. The assumption behind the EIS is not that cars should move as quickly as possible but rather that mitigation might be needed due to the incremental change in traffic due to the stadium.

In regard to lighting, the EIS will look at views and whether lighting from the stadium will have effects that will need to be mitigated. Some of the EIS topics will apply to the construction phase, some to the completed projected and some to both phases. In response to a question from Hussein Ahmed, Handeland said he would follow up regarding whether or not the EIS would include an assessment of materials to be used in building the stadium.

Handeland briefly outlined how the EIS process would proceed:

- 1) Now that the EIS consultant has been selected, the firm will coordinate with City staff and other agencies to gather information.
- 2) This information will inform the draft EIS Scope that will be published in December, 2012
- 3) In March 2013, the draft EIS will be published. City staff will then review it and prepare comments to be taken to the City's Transportation and Public Works Committee and then to the City Council.

In addition, City staff will keep the Implementation Committee (IC) informed of any pertinent EIS issues as the IC prepares to make its comments on the stadium design.

In response to a question from Tom Meyer, Nilsson said that typically the EIS process would not begin while the Schematic Design is being developed. In the case of the Stadium, however, the draft EIS will be available at the same time that the 60-day review period for the Schematic Design begins.

In response to questions from Peter McLaughlin, Nilsson said that this EIS does not include a "no build" option. Also, the stadium legislation stipulates that the stadium is a "permitted use".

McLaughlin expressed concern that the EIS might not adequately address issues related to the impact of such a large building being placed in a neighborhood. He noted the importance of addressing this issue now with the building architects rather than relying on the formal EIS process.

Discussion ensued about key issues likely to come out of the EIS. It will be important to coordinate the Implementation Committee's adopted design and planning principles with the EIS issues and convey this information to the architects in time to have an impact on the design.

**It was the consensus of the committee that staff would go through the EIS topics and determine which of adopted planning and design principles address them. Particular attention would be paid to the 3 –5 EIS topics likely to be most important. This information would be conveyed to the EIS team and to the architects.**

Colvin Roy spoke to the importance of having the EIS issues identified before January when the 50% schematic design is completed. Handeland said that the City has suggested to the EIS consultant that attention be paid first to those EIS topics that relate to the stadium building and its design.

## **6.0 Subcommittee Progress Reports**

- **Design** - Tom Fisher and Tom Meyer met with HKS regarding the design and planning principles. The architects are committed to designing a great building.
- **Planning** – David Wilson reviewed the latest draft of the planning principles (appendix B). The principles focus on what it should be like to live, work and recreate in the area. Judy Borger reported that she has received nothing but positive comments from her neighbors about the principles.

**It was MOVED and SECONDED that the Planning Principles be approved.** Diane Hofstede requested modification of language about 24-hour activity to instead call for appropriate hours for mixed-use areas. **MOTION CARRIED. Staff will modify the principles to incorporate Hofstede's suggestion.**

- **Stakeholder** – Peggy Lucas reported that the committee has met with an number of knowledgeable people including Bill Lester, Melvin Tennant from Meet Minneapolis, Bill Stead from the State High School league and Corey Merrifield, IC member and expert on fan tailgating. The list of stadium stakeholders continues to grow and is currently two pages long.

A representative of the Warehouse District has been added to the Stakeholder subcommittee. Discussion is underway regarding how best to include the Warehouse District in Purple Path pre-game activities. Lutz said a plan would be brought forward in 2013 that might necessitate City Council approvals.

Lucas said the subcommittee is actively seeking information about the stakeholder experience and in particular which urban areas do it best.

**7.0 Next Meeting** – Monday Dec.17 @ 4 p.m. Room 319 City Hall (meeting later canceled and re-scheduled to Thurs Jan. 31<sup>st</sup> @ 4 p.m. Room 319 City Hall)

**8.0 Adjournment** – 5:40 p.m.